

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,122	03/11/2004	Seizo Suzuki	249476US-2CONT	4660
22850	7590 08/11/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET			PHAN, JAMES	
	ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	
			DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/797,122	SUZUKI ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		James Phan	2872			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 10) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5) <u>□</u> 6)⊠	· ·					
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10)🖾	10) \boxtimes The drawing(s) filed on <u>11 March 2004</u> is/are: a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 10/278,916. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachmen	ot(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date		Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/797,122

Art Unit: 2872

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). The certified copy has been filed in parent Application No. 10/278,916, filed on 10/24/02.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 19 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/278,916. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the optical scanning apparatus defined in both conflicting claims contains the same structure. Note that "An image forming apparatus" recited in the preamble of claim 19 has been fully considered; however, no patentable weight has been given because the body of the claim only defines an optical scanning apparatus.

Application/Control Number: 10/797,122

Art Unit: 2872

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 19-22 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of copending Application No. 10/278,916 in view of Aoki et al. Claim 1 of the copending application defined the same optical scanning apparatus as that of the image forming apparatus recited in claim 19. The difference between claim 19 of the present application and claim 1 of the copending application is that claim 1 of the copending application does not define an image forming apparatus, such as laser printer, facsimile machine or digital copier. However, the use of an optical scanning apparatus in an image forming apparatus, such as laser printer, facsimile machine or digital copier, for forming an image is well known in the art (see Aoki et al, in column 1, lines 9-16). Thus, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the scanning apparatus of claim 1 for forming an image forming apparatus, such as laser printer, facsimile machine or digital copier, as taught in Aoki et al for forming an image.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-2317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-2312. The fax

Art Unit: 2872

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phan, J. Aug. 9, 2004

> James Phan Primery Examiner